Tarwad and Karanavan, received the support of the Non-official Members of the Council, who belong to the community which will be most affected by the Bill. In regard to the subject of partition, I do not propose to say anything now. But I would repeat the assurance I have already given to Mr. Madhavan Tampi, that we do not propose to treat either that, or for the matter of that, any other provision of the Bill, as so vital, that the circumstance that you now accept the general principle of the Bill, would be taken to fetter in any way the discretion, either of the Select Committee or of the Council, to make such alterations as may be needed, or thought to be needed, later on. The opinions of the Samantha and Nair Members of the last Assembly would be communicated to the Select Committee for their consideration, as also the representations about the Bill received from other bodies since the Assembly. *The utmost latitude would be allowed to the Committee as well as to the Council to shape the Bill in its final form in such a way as would make it most useful and least injurious.* I only hope that the efforts we are making, and in which I am glad to see that we have the co-operation of the people most affected, will be crowned with success. With these words, I shall take it that the general principle of the Bill is affirmed, subject to the objection raised by some of you to the Chapter on Partition and to the two definitions, and that you have no objection to the Bill being referred to a Committee.

The Council having then affirmed the principle of the Bill generally, Mr. Ananda Row moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, consisting of Messrs Krishnan Nair, Raman Pillai, Kesava Pillai, Easwara Pillai, Madhavan Tampi and the Mover, to report within three months.

The motion was put and agreed to.

THE HIGH COURT REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. Ananda Row.—Sir, having obtained the permission of the Council at the last meeting to introduce a Bill to amend the High Court Regulation, I beg to introduce the Bill. As explained in the Statement of Objects and Reasons appended to the Draft Bill, the proposal is to invest single Judges of the High Court with some additional powers, and, in doing so, all that has been attempted is to put them on a footing of equality with the powers with which single Judges in the High Courts in British India are invested. No attempt has been made to invest the single Judges of the High Court with any power not possessed by the Judges of the High Courts in British India. Further, the state of work in the High Court is such that, unless the additional powers are given in the matter of the disposal of miscellaneous proceedings, involving no particular principle, it is not likely that the congestion of work will be cured. With these remarks, I beg to move that the principle of the Bill be affirmed.

Seconded by Mr. Vieyra.

Mr. Kesava Pillai.— Sir, I regret I have to oppose the principle of the Bill. Even when permission was sought for to introduce the Bill, I thought that this was a measure in which there would be a difference of opinion. Subsequently, the Vakils' Association have passed a unanimous Resolution that this Bill is not necessary. A measure of this kind is not a matter of much importance as far as the High Court themselves are concerned. The time that will be saved to them is comparatively very little; but I submit that it *is* a matter of some importance, that we should not, in framing a law, do anything which will appear not satisfactory to the Members of the Bar or to the general public. I therefore think that this Bill is not necessary.

Mr. Cameron.— I approve of the principle of the Bill, as it would help to simplify the procedure in the disposal of miscellaneous matters.

Mr. Sri Narayanan Tampi.— I do not approve of the principle of the Bill.

Mr. Easwara Pillai.— I am also of the same opinion.

Mr. Madhavan Tampi.— I am also opposed to the principle of the Bill.

President.— Gentlemen, I do not wish just now to inflict a speech on you, but as one of the reasons mentioned by Mr. Kesava Pillai in opposing the Bill, is the Resolution

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

of the Vakils' Association, I would just say a word in regard to that. The Association have forwarded to me a copy of their Resolution, but, as it was received only half an hour ago, I have not been able to give it that careful consideration, which, I have no doubt, it is entitled to. I may tell you, on behalf of the Government, that the changes proposed in the Bill have been pressed upon us by successive Chief Justices; they are changes which have found acceptance at the hands of successive Dewans, and they have been practically agreed to by all the Judges of the High Court. The matters, which are proposed to be delegated to a single Judge, are mostly interlocutory matters, which there could be no risk in entrusting a single Judge with. If, in any particular case, a single Judge thinks that it would be well to get it disposed of by a Division Bench, it is open to him, under the present law, to arrange for such disposal.

The motion was then put to the vote and carried by a majority, Messrs. Krishnan Nair, Padmanabha Iyer, Vieyra, Subrahmanya Iyer, Raman Pillai and Cameron voting for the motion, and Messrs. Kesava Pillai, Sri Narayanan Tampi, Easwara Pillai and Madhavan Tampi voting against it.

The Council having thus affirmed the principle of the Bill, by a majority, Mr. Ananda Row moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, consisting of Messrs. Krishnan Nair, Vieyra, Kesava Pillai and the Mover, to report within two months.

The motion was put and agreed to.

The Council adjourned at 1-55 P. M.

P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI,
Dewan.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly